REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 16-18 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 15 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to recite features supported in the specification at paragraph **[0024]**. Claims 3, 4 and 6 are amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen during the November 17, 2004 interview. In accordance with MPEP §713.04, the points discussed during the interview are incorporated in the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 and 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Japanese Patent Publication JP 06-084411 to Imamura *et al.* (hereinafter "Imamura") in view of U.S. Patent 4,268,714 to Mori; and claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Imamura in view of Mori and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,444,902 to Tsao *et al.* (hereinafter "Tsao"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Imamura and Mori, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest a flat shield cable including a plurality of parallel signal lines, each of the signal lines having an insulating cover, wherein an outer diameter of each signal wire is in a range of 1.27 mm to 1.40 mm, a cross-sectional area of a core conductor of each signal wire is in a range of 0.05 to 0.08 mm^2, a drain line disposed on a first side of the signal lines, a dummy line disposed on a second side of the signal lines, a shield tape covering the signal lines, the drain line, and the dummy line, the shield tape including a metal foil, a polymer layer and an adhesive film, the metal foil being adjacent the signal lines, the drain line and the dummy line, the polymer layer adjacent to the metal foil, and the adhesive film being adjacent to the polymer layer, and an

insulating sheath covering the shield layer and being adjacent to the adhesive film, wherein the plurality of signal lines, the drain line and the dummy line are co-planar, and the adhesive connecting the polymer layer and the insulating sheath to enable removal of the insulating sheath and the polymer layer together without also removing the metal foil, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Imamura discloses a flat shield cable of coplanar lines including a plurality of signal lines (1) with insulating covers (2), a drain line and a dummy line (8) on opposite sides of the signal lines (abstract and drawing 1(b) of Imamura).

Moreover, as discussed during the interview, Mori discloses a shielded wire with a plastic insulation layer 2 covering an inner conductor 1. In particular, Mori teaches covering the layer 2 with a shielding tape 33 that includes a metal foil 41, a polymer layer 42 and an adhesive film 43 (col. 2, lines 58-68, col. 3, lines 13-21 and Figs. 4 and 5(a) of Mori).

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the coplanar lines of Imamura with the multi-layered shielding tape of Mori, nor has the Office Action established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In addition, neither Imamura nor Mori provide dimensional features that teach or suggest the outer diameter of the signal wire or the cross-sectional area of the core conductor of the signal wire. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

Also, Tsao does not compensate for the deficiencies of Imamura and Mori outlined above for claim 1. Nor does Tsao teach, disclose or suggest the additional features recited in claim 6 regarding comparative diameters of the drain and dummy lines. Instead, Tsao discloses an electric cable with shielded signal wire pairs 12 flanked by drain wires 14 and 16. In particular, Tsao teaches the drain wire 14 between two wire pairs 12, and drain wires 16 on opposite sides of the drain wire 14 along a plane 10 (col. 2, lines 24-38 and Fig. 2 of

Tsao). There is no teaching or suggestion of Tsao of a dummy line for structural stiffening. Thus, Tsao fails to teach or suggest the features of Applicant's claims.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the flanking drain wires of Tsao with the coplanar lines of Imamura and the shielding tape of Mori, nor has the Office Action established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness for a §103 rejection requires satisfaction of three basic criteria: there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the references or combine reference teachings, a reasonable expectation of success, and the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §706.02(j)). Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with Imamura, Mori and Tsao.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejected independent claim is now patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§103 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

Date: December 3, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461